

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING	G DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/463,904	06/05/1995		JOSEPH B. PHIPPS	ARC-2399	9244
48394	7590	10/24/2006		EXAMINER	
DIEHL SER	VILLA LL	C	BOCKELMAN, MARK		
77 BRANT A	VE		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 110	05066			ART ORT	TALERIONDER
CLARK, NJ	07066			3766	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	08/463,904	PHIPPS, JOSEPH B.	
Lammer-indated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mark W. Bockelman	3766	
All Participants:	Status of Application: _		
(1) Mark W. Bockelman.	(3)		
(2) <u>Glen Diehl</u> .	(4)		
Date of Interview: 20 October 2006	Time:		
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Appl Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	elicant's representative)		
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed:			
Claims discussed:			
Prior art documents discussed:			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEI See Continuation Sheet	NERAL NATURE OF WHAT WA	AS DISCUSSED:	
Part III.			
 ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separal directly resulted in the allowance of the application. of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separal did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summer 	The examiner will provide a wr te record of the substance of the	itten summary of the substance ne interview, since the interview	
·			
. 0.4/			
Milkell			
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applic	cant/Applicant's Representative	Signature – if appropriate)	

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The telephone call was to clarify the interview summary form mailed 10-6-2006. The examiner meant to merely provide a copy of the IDS of 12-11-1996. The examiner checked the wrong box that indicated the case was being allowed. Rather, the completed IDS mailed to applicant was necessary for the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences to consider the appeal.